



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/597,164	07/13/2006	Kwang-Sik Kim	2080-31	7020
53706 IPLA P.A. 3550 WILSHIRE BLVD. 17TH FLOOR LOS ANGELES, CA 90010	7590 06/14/2010		<div>EXAMINER</div> <div>GRABOWSKI, KYLE ROBERT</div>	
			<div>ART UNIT</div> <div>3725</div>	<div>PAPER NUMBER</div>
			<div>MAIL DATE</div> <div>06/14/2010</div>	<div>DELIVERY MODE</div> <div>PAPER</div>

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/597,164

Applicant(s)

KIM ET AL.

Examiner

Kyle Grabowski

Art Unit

3725

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 February 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3, 4, 7 and 8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3, 4, 7 and 8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/GS/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the claims and RCE filed on 02/25/10

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hires (US 2,254,893). Hires discloses a binder sheet removably inserted into a binder comprising: a binding portion, having holes 2, and a paper storing portion 4; left and right vertical bands 13 and 14, each having a predetermined width and length attached near left and right edges of the binder sheet (Fig. 1); The adhesive which connects the bands 13 and 14 to the binder sheet may be construed to be upper and lower attachment lines (Fig. 4); The structure disclosed in Hires is functionally capable of exposing substantially large portions of sheets; The spacing of the bands is determined by the articles to be displayed (Col. 2, 2-7). Hires discloses that the straps may be transparent i.e. the binder sheet is made of a transparent material, at least in part.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

6. Claims 1, 3, 7, and 8, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dick (US 1,495,953) in view of Hires (US 2,254,893). Dick discloses a binder sheet comprising: a binding portion (e.g. the region around holes 2), a paper storing portion (e.g. the rest of the binder sheet), and a lower horizontal band attached to a lower portion of the paper storing portion; the band has left, right, and lower attachment lines, defining a pocket (Fig. 1). Substantially large portions of paper may be exposed (e.g. articles 8) (Fig. 3). Dick does not disclose an upper horizontal band or a middle horizontal band however Hires teaches these bands as detailed above (the only difference being a non-structural orientation from horizontal to); Hires also teaches that the bands are determined by the articles to be bound and that the bands are thin (e.g.

the height of the lower portion of Dick is much larger than the width of the bands 13/14 of Hires). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the binder sheet taught in Dick with horizontal bands in view of Hires to facilitate the assembly and display of various items (Col. 1, 1-6). One of ordinary skill in the art would deduce that a middle and upper horizontal location on the Dick patent would be suitable locations to facilitate the articles as shown (Dick, Figure 3).

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3, 7, and 8, have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

8. In respect to claim 4, applicant's arguments filed on 02/25/10 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The application contends that "the spaces in the album leaf are not determined by the articles" however the examiner disagrees. Hires states that the spaces are "to receive the articles to be displayed" (Col. 2, 4-5) which is synonymous "determined by the articles". Furthermore, this is a product by process recitation e.g. how the spacing is determined and it does not further limit the structure being claimed.

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kyle Grabowski whose telephone number is (571)270-3518. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dana Ross can be reached on (571)272-4480. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kyle Grabowski/
Examiner, Art Unit 3725

/Dana Ross/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 3725